SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

RECEIVED
JUN 1 1982
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

t.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland

against

ohn L O'Brien jr
egistry of Deeds

No._____

EMORANDUM

CHRISTIANS MUST OBEY PROPERLY APPOINTED AUTHORITY

Christians must obey properly appointed authority. Such a tatement is accepted at face value without a second thought. In fact it suggest a peurile reductio-ad-absurdum quality. However, n closer examination the few shallow words acquire unexpected epth.

By definition, the word "Christian" is that of professing or elonging to Christianity, a religion based on teachings of Jesus hrist; a human being as distinguished from one of the lower animals; decent, civilized or presentable person.

However, the Christian Definition of "Christian" is something lse. "Christian" is defined as a man who has accepted Jesus hrist as his Lord and Saviour...an entirely different concept. nd, thus accepting Jesus Christ is ordained a Minister of God's aw of Liberty and Justice (which are the teachings of the Testaments) nd is Son-and-Heir to God. This gives him the responsibility of ersonal ministry of God's Word. For, every man accepting Jesus hrist is ordained a MINISTER by God. Subsequent ordinations by hurch Elders or Divinity School are those <u>by man</u>; and unless ordained y God, are mere cosmetics.

By definition "obedient": obeying, willing to obey; submissive o restraint, control or command. Obedient implies compliance with he demands or requests of one in authority. Such a definition is, f course, highly unsatisfactory for it does not properly shade the uantity or quality of "obedience", and thus remains vague. A yrant demands are not the same as those of a man imbued with espect for God's Law of Liberty & Justice.

The word "proper" has many definitions: in the archaic (which is o doubt the true though disused definition)...honest, chaste, espectable, correct, decorous, decent; while the modern accepted efinition turns more on: special to, or appointed for...suitably, itly, rightly. Thus "proper" becomes <u>most</u> important; and, because f its double-meaning, the most confusing.

In order to establish just what a Christian is required to obey, it becomes necessary to examine the object of that obedience: "authority". By definition: leagal or rightful power; a right to command or to act; jurisdiction; power due to opinion or esteem; influence of character, station, mental or moral superiority, or the like. Thus, by definition is established authority may be a person, a position, or a psychological effect, probably a numinous aura established more-or-less by personal competence(?).

But, incompetence brings in other facets of "authority": "authoritarian" is defined as advocating the principle of obedience to authority as opposed to individual liberty. This, of course, is a horror.

Yet there is something far worse. When the authority refuses to be governed by its own laws, then it has established government-crime, government-anarchy. The definition of "anarchy" is most enlightening. As a general rule it is most often the label used on recalcitrants; however, the government can be equally guilty, and most offten more so.

"Anarchy": state of society where there is no law or supreme power; a state of political disorder or confusion; breakdown in law or order, total absence or suspension of government: chaos, utter negation of law or order, lawlessness, a prevalent or habitual disregard of law or order.

Thus, in "Christians must obey Properly appointed Authority", it is important to determine what a Christian is, what Authority is and what constitutes "Properly Appointed". The key word it "Properly".

Is the politician who lies to voters during his campaigns, and in office, properly appointed? Of course not. For, lying is a particular abomination tothe Lord God. A politician in office, regardless of whether he admits it or not, is in office to administer God's Law of Liberty & Justice. The mere fact that he deluded enough people to get him there does not absolbe him of his ministry duties.

Is the legislator that judases or watergates the robbery of the people through issuance of fiat money in violation of the Constitution properly appointed? Most certainly NO. For, God's Commandment is simple, clear, and direct: Thou shalt not steal.

Is the judge who declares it is perfectly lawful to kill.... by calling it abortion...properly appointed? Absolutely NOT. God Commanded against murder. No semantic play-on-words can obscure murder, or salve the guilt of humanist-perversion.

Nor can a government be termed "properly appointed" that violates the Constitution in robbing its people of lawful money and substituting fiat, foreign-owned and alien, federal reserve notes

which are obligations-of-the-U.S.government (I.O.U.s) upon which evidence-of-debt it charges INTEREST. That is USURY. And God has specifically forbidden that.

Can a man, politician, legislator, judge, officer be properly appointed if he betrays his post and his office...not once but so many countless times that betrayal becomes the "norm"? Of course not.

Eighteen hundred years ago, a famous Roman lawyer faced that dilema. He resolved it by becoming a Christian/and turned his back on the corruption of man-made law. Tertullian. He established that Christianity is of God; and that which is not-of-God, is thereby of Satan.

Thus, Properly Appointed Authority, in order to remain Properly Appointed, must uphold the Constitution of the United States, which was derived, via the Common Law, from the Testaments, the Written Word of God, and thus, must uphold God's Law of Liberty & Justice. Anything less is, of course, satanization of the government. For, either the government is of-God or it is NOT.

Just how is a Christian affected by a not-of-God government? The answer is Bound in both the Old and the New Testaments. The Christian is sternly and wrathfully prohibited from joining-with or glorifying Satan and his works. Nor can the Christian compromise with Evil.

Even the Nuremberg Trials established that the citizen is NOT required to obey an Evil government. When the defendants pleaded that they were following orders, the American Justices...from the Supreme Court...said that was not an adequate defence; that they must disobey Evil orders, that by obeying they accepted responsibility for their actions.

That when laws are presented to the Christian that mock God, they, of course, violate Amendment I Rights so that by the Constitution, Nuremberg, and by his conscience, the Christian is NOT required.

For, the law-"givers" have failed-to-protect the Christian; and, even under the Common Law, Amend 4, and Article X of the Const for the Commonwealth of Mass. the Christian is not required to pay nor obey. His God commands that "Resistance to Tyranny is Obedience to God".

And, it fs further held in the Preamble, Amendments 9 & 10 that the Citizen is the Sovereign, the Master/ that the government is the Servant/under Contract, a contract to which the Sovereign Citizen is Third-Party, Non-Signer. That, having retained his Sovereignty he can declare an anarchic-government OUTLAW in all good Christian-conscience...and be correct in so doing.

The Supreme Court, and the lower courts, time and time-again repeatedly emphasized that this nation IS a Christian nation. That it must uphold the Christian Ethic that is the compelling force by which the Christian lives. The nation has no choice; it must live under God....or die.

Thus, Christians must obey properly appointed authority...but that authority must uphold God's Law of Liberty & Justice; and must remain as a Christian authority properly appointed. For, when a lying politician appoints subordinates or non-elective posts, those appointed are not constituted "proper" on the original improper appointment of authority.

The Christian can NOT glorify Satan.

However, the above applies only to the Christian. The Non-Christian has no alternative. He must OBEY, or become a Christian.

respectfully submitted

Rt Rev Dr Edward Wayland Pastor
pro se
forma pauperis

Sovereign Citizen
Amends. 9,10,14; Preamble

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 1008
LOWELL, MASS. 01853

MEMORANDUM ACCESS TO JUSTICE

16 AmJur2d Constitutional Law, Section 382 (718) states, with multiple citations:

"S.382. GUARANTY OF FREE JUSTICE AND OPEN COURTS GENERALLY

"In most of the state constitutions there are provisions varying slightly in terms, which stipulate that justice shall be administered to all without delay or denial, without sale or prejudice, and that the courts shall always be open to all alike. The word 'injury' as employed in such a constitutional declaration implies the doing of some act which constitutes an invasion of a legal right, and cannot be considered as referring to all evils which may affect mankind. These provisions are based largely upon the Magna Carta, Chapter 40, which provides: 'We will sell to no man, we will not deny to any man, either justice or right.' The chief purpose of the Magna Carta provision was to prohibit the king from selling justice by imposing fees on litigants through his courts and to deal a death blow to the attendant venal and disgraceful practices of a corrupt judiciary in demanding oppressive gratuities for giving or withholding decisions in pending causes. It has been appropriately said that in a free government the doors of litigation are already wide open and must constantly remain so. The extent of the constitutional provision has been regarded as broarder than the original confines of Magna Carta, and such constitutional provision has been held to prohibit the selling of justice not merely by magistrates but by the state itself.

"A constitutional provision that right and justice shall be administered according to such guarantees is mandatory upon the departments of government. Hence, it requires that a cause shall not be heard before a prejudiced court....These guarantees cannot be destroyed, denied, abridged, or impaired by legislative enactments."

Rt Rev'd Edward Wayland Bishop

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 1008
LOWELL, MASS. 01853

MEMORANDUM JURY TRIAL

The Constitution of the United States imposes on the States the requirements of a trial by jury, in criminal by Article 3 Section 2; and Amendment 6; in civil by Amendment 7. It has also been determined that the words "Law of the Land" or "due process of law" when used in consideration of property rights....also means a determination thereof by a jury.

The determination by jury is common law going back to the Magna Carta, 1215 for the determinative purpose, in limiting the powers of government, by guaranteeing the jury remain in control.

Nor can the right to jury trial be hedged nor amended.....

Section 18 (47 AmJur2d)

> "....the ommission from the constitutional guarantees of a jury trial of an enumeration of the details or incidents of the right of trial by jury does not give the legislature or the courts authority to destroy any of the substantial elements of the right which was intended to be secured."

Section 20 (47 AmJur2d)

> "The right of trial by jury, where it is granted by constitutional or statutory provisions, cannot be taken away or impaired by the courts...." "The view has been taken that a court sitting without a jury where there is a right to a jury trial which has not been waived, HAS NO JURISDICTION OF THE CASE."

Section 47 (47 AmJur2d) further spells out that in criminal cases the litigant is guaranteed the right to trial by jury; and in Section 48, further emphasis is made by Article 3 in that, together with Amendment 6, it is binding upon the States, and by the common law (including Section 50) the jury has the right to determine the law and the facts.

And that...Section 83(47 AmJur2d)

"...provides that such a waiver (of jury trial) must clearly and affirmatively upon the record, WAIVER CANNOT BE ASSUMED OR IMPLIED FROM THE SILENCE OF THE ACCUSED OR HIS MERE FAILURE TO DEMAND A JURY TRIAL."

The mandate of Amendment 7 is equally clear and concise:

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right to trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

47 AmJur2d states bluntly that the litigant cannot be deprived of his right to trial by jury by legislation, or executive or judicial edict; for, to do so is to lose jurisdiction.

Rt Revd Dr Edward Wayland Jr

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 1008
LOWELL, MASS. 01853

MEMORANDUM

SOVEREIGN CITIZEN
SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY
MINISTER//AFFIDAVIT

The purpose of this Memorandum is to establish, without questions, the exact jurisdiction/authority of the Citizen, and that of the government, both State and Federal.

Justice Marshall, in the U.S.Supreme Court, confused a clear-cut issue of juriddiction/-uthority in 1821 when he pulled out of thin air, without grounds or foundation, the theory of Sovereign Immunity of the government; and the fictio- that the government could not be held accouptable without its consent. Thus, in one step, Marshall reduced the Soverei n Citizen to a peon at the beck and call of government. For, nowhere in the Constitution of the U.S. is such power granted...and enumerated.

The Preamble, Amendments 9, 10 of the U.S.Constitution establish and re-affirm that the Constitution of the U.S. is CONTRACT between government as SERVANT and Citizen (Third-party Non-signer) who remains Master and SOVEREIGN. Thus it is established that the Citizen is not only SOVEREIGN, but that i- such capacity, it is the Citizen, not Government that has total SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

This is further affirmed by the Common Law (Christian, not former king's self-serving courts, not Federal Court attempt to make-law by "case-law"). Under the Common Law there are but two categories: Private-Wrong and Public-Wrong. Private-Wrong is, of course, litigation between citizens, which is Civil. Public-Wrong is Criminal. It is litigation between government (as one of the litigants) and the Sovereign Citizen, regardless of what the name of the case is named. Being Criminal, all Proceedural Safeguardds Apply for the Protection of the Sovereign Citizen; and the Burden-

of-Proof remains upon that of the Government, especially when the constitutionality of action, rules, "law" is challenged.

Thus, violations of the Constitution are not just "Civil-Rights" which is euphonic legalism, but in fact: perjury, felony, treason, anarchy and outlaw.

The Declaration of Independence further affirms the Sovereignty of the Citizen, and by the "consent of governed" clause (which is valid under article 6(1,2,3) U.S.Constitution) establishes the Immunities of the Citizen in relation to government, that the government remains under Contract TO the Sovereign Citizen.

A brief summary of the Sovereign Citizen Rights is to be found in the Body-of-Liberties, 1641, the Massachusetts Magna Carta, which provisions found the way into the U.S.Constitution: FREEMAN, Freehold (Allodial) property rights (absolute ownership), jury trial, due process, etc.etc.etc.etc.

However, Amendment 17 adds both confusion and corruption to the government. It never issued from Congress with the required Constitutional 2/3rds vote; and was not properly ratified by 3/4ths of the legal states; and was thus improperly signed into "law". So that, after 1914, the election of Senators was unConstitutionally changed from that by state legislatures to that by the citizens. This, of course, is null and void as though it had never been passed (AmJur2d Constitutional Law, Courts, Jurisdiction, Jury) and constitutes a FRAUD.

Since 1915, none of the functions of the Amend.17-Senate are legal, lawful, Constitutional. This establishes the federal government, at best as FRAUD, and at worst as a collection of rogues and scoundrels protected by Marshall's fictitious Sovereign Immunity.

The Body-of-Liberties, 1641 furthere establishes, as found in Amendment 1 ESTABLISHMENT and FREE EXERCISE clauses, that the government is to no longer use the Church for Judgments that might not be readily made in the courts. From 1641, the courts were no longer required to ENFORCE Theological Judgments; but the courts were required to HONOR them as valid, binding law.

The state could no longer control the Church; but there were no such restraints upon the Church which could assist, guide, direct, etc. the state. This is the ONLY separation made between Church and State; and nowhere in the Constitution were the provisions that government could violate or interfere in Theological areas.

And, as Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity, it is the Citizen and the Minister, not government, who is to determine what a Theological Area is or is-to-be.

Under Shipboard Covenant, 1636, the nation-to-be was dedicated, in Covenant, to God, and thus officially became a Christian nation. As such, the Common Law became established as that founded upon

the Old and New Testaments. A Common Law affidavit is one that is signed in the presence of two or more witnesses, who affirm that signature with their own. And, it is Written in Scripture that the signature of the Minister is equivalent to 2-3, or more, witnesses, and needs no further corroboration.

Thus, the signature of the Minister establishes Affidavit of ALL complaints, pleadings, etc.; and, as such can be countered only by two or more counter Affidavits. This has NOT been done.

Thus, the signature of attorney, if valid under Amend.17-Senate, is but a "signature of merit" and can NOT counter, answer, nor deny the Affidavit of the Minister's Signature. Thus, establishing that the "signature of merit" is of lesser weight.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 8; Common Law; multiple U.S.S.Ct. decisions (res judicata) establish that any complaint or pleading that is not denied (in total), answered is admitted/averred as TRUE, which admissions remain TRUE. No "case-law" can change that which is admitted, regardless of alleged judicial findings. Nor can judicial finding be applied to subsequent cases (Green v U.S.) for only the parties of a particular litigation be bound by the FINDING (not the pleadings). To attempt to rule-in case-law is judicial make-law in violation of the Constitution wherein only the Legislature has that enumerated right and authority.

Case-law applied unconstitutionally is loss of any alleged jurisdiction/authority by the branch of government applying it: Executive/Legislative/Judiciary; for case-law, and quic'sand statutes are "legalisms", not Constitution, that angered Jesus Christ to the point where HE damned, for all eternity, the scribes, pharisees, sadducees. "Legalisms" is NOT God's Law of Liberty & Justice, and establishes injustice and evils of corruption in government.

The U.S.S.Ct. justices at Nuremberg waived aside the defenses of the accused on the grounds that NO citizen is required to obey an evil law, evil order, evil government. In fact, Scripture states bluntly that the Christian is not only bound not to honor evil, but is required to resist it. For, that which is not of God is of Satan. And, government-corruption is not of God.

Any violation of the Constitution is a corruption.
(Brandeis; Olmstead v U.S.; Douglas; Branzeberg v Hayes)

Thus, where it is affirmed that the signature of Minister establishes Affidavit, such signature also establishes Theological Judgment. Thus, all complaints, pleadings are Theological Judgment, and must be HONORED as such by the government. JTo refuse to HONOR is to violate Amend.1 and Body-of-Liberty provisions. Amendments 9,10 further establish, arising under the Preamble, that all such Complaints and Pleadings are and remain Theological Judgment.

Such Theological Judgment remains of greater weight than all the case-law, quicksand statutes, and assorted legalisms. It remains in effect regardless of any Amend.17-Senate court findings; and

by the self-damnation providions in Theolo~ical Judgment as being opposition to God's Minister is bound in heaven as on earth.

Thereby, the court has only the jurisdiction/authority granted by the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity; and cannot usurp any other. Only the Common Law Jury per pais peers can grant to the court a limited jurisdiction/authority. And, since the Civil War it is extremely difficult to find any cases tried Common Law Jury per pais peers. The verdict of an Amend.17-Senate judge is thereby suspect; and not being made under the Common Law Jury cannot be legally, lawfully, Constitutionally cited.

Thus, the Sovereign Citizen, Sovereign Immunity Minister has no alternative but to disclaim jurisdiction/authority that may or may not have been sneaked past him, without informing him of such and without his consent/permission in writing of all rules, regulations, quicksand statutes, legalisms, administrative law, commercial and merchant laws, etc.etc.etc., and retains his total Sovereign Immunity. That where the government, as SERVANT, claims Sovereign Immunity, the Citizen as MASTER is thereby MORE Sovereign and entitled to greater SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

It is thus established that the government is not the Constitution; and is bound in Contract, Covenant, and Faith by that Constitution. But, that government has become a haven for rogues and scoundrels. This was not the intent of the Founders. Nor is it what the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Minister has agreed to.

The Sovereign Citizen remains a Citizen of the United States, but the government has ceased, by the Constitution, to be lawful, legal, Constitutional.

In the early days when a man had a grievance, he redressed it himself. During the formation of societies he gave up that right on the theory that when he was grieved the entire society was grieved and the society redressed it for him. But when that society refuses to redress it for him; and when that society IS the source of that grievance, it has given back to that man the right to redress it himself. In a situation like that, the Sovereign Citizen has no alternative but to REVOKE his "consent of the governed".

So be it.

Rt Rev Dr Edward Wayland Pastor pro se
forma pauperis
Sovereign Citizen; Preamble.A.9,10
Sovereign Immunity; " " " "

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 1008
LOWELL, MASS. 01853

Moses said to pharaoh
Let MY people go

Thus, this memorandum, being signed by Minister is bothAffidavit and Theological Judgment.